

HT
394
S25
F88
1963
copy 1
IGSL

The Future of the Bay Area

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

DEC 04 1997

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

**March 2, 1963
Oakland, California**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C101743794>

HT394
S25
F88
1963
copy 1
IGSL
UCB

The Bay Area is moving into a period during which it will experience its greatest growth—as well as an intensification of the growth-induced problems and challenges that we must meet.

As a metropolitan area grows, the inter-relationships of the component communities become increasingly complex. The effective use and development of an area's resources depend more and more upon a regional, rather than component, approach.

The remarks of the several speakers at the Future of the Bay Area Conference, held in Oakland, California, on March 2, 1963, are here reprinted in their entirety in the belief that they may serve to stimulate further thought and action in formulating an effective regional approach.

Though there have been meetings in the past to discuss individual regional matters such as regional planning, recreation, industrial development, etc., this conference represented the first over-all look at the entire picture of the future of the Bay Area.

A significant result of this conference, over and above the general interest expressed in regional problems, has been the formation, by the three sponsoring organizations, the Bay Area Council, Association of Bay Area Governments and the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, of a Joint Committee to coordinate their various efforts in carrying out projects and activities of regional interest in the San Francisco Bay Area. The formation of this committee marks a major step forward in regional unity.

Additional copies may be obtained from the
Bay Area Council
World Trade Center
San Francisco 11, Calif.

WAYNE THOMPSON

City Manager, City of Oakland

President, International City Managers Association

Keynote Address

It was a beautiful spring day, about 200 years ago, when Juan Bautista de Anza and a small band of explorers hiked over the ridge of a small hill on the southern end of the peninsula and saw for the first time the beauties of our Bay. He stopped . . . stared . . . and marveled at the sight of "an inland sea." He wrote:

This port is a marvel of nature, and might well be called the 'harbor of harbors' . . . and I think if it could be well settled like Europe, there would not be anything more beautiful.

That was the prediction of the great future of the Bay Area by the first European to see our Bay.

Some say that Captain William Richardson, who settled here 141 years ago saw the first industrial future of the Bay. At the time, the Presidio was about to be abandoned because supplies were being hauled from San Jose and with a good ox team the round trip took at least a week. Richardson recognized the need for more rapid transit to improve the area's economy. So he built a schooner, and hauled as much in a week as the old ox teams had been able to haul in a year. Although history tells us little about technological unemployment of ox teams, we do know that the Presidio was saved by the Bay Area's first Transit System.

All the way our Bay Area history is the exciting story of change—from Indian villages to the Space Age in just 200 years. It was just 100 years ago that our City of Oakland looked up to such large urban centers as Dutch Flat, Grass Valley, and Mokelumne Hill.

Nowhere in the world do 4 million souls live amongst such grandeur and beauty, with such ideal weather along ocean and bay shores, amidst mountains and redwood groves. It is fitting that we are meeting here in the center of population of Northern California, and we know that only 4 other metropolitan areas in the country exceed our population—and none exceed our area.

Here in Alameda County alone, our area is large enough to accommodate two complete New York Cities with enough space left over to fit in all of Philadelphia as well.

You represent the most beautiful metropolitan area on the surface of the earth; 7,000 square miles of land area and 500 square miles of water area—7,500 square miles in all. This is more than half as large as the sovereign state of Belgium and also larger than our new State of Hawaii. We are certainly not advocating it; but we find that we could drop the entire City of Los Angeles into our Bay and have three square miles of water space left over.

Bold leadership and engineering marvels have unified our great area and brought it closer together. Two leaders who stand out as examples of boldness, persistence and skill are Joseph B. Strauss and Charles Henry Pursell, who believed that bridges could link the communities around the Bay. Their vision and genius overcame every possible obstacle to create the two greatest bridges ever built.

Another dream that is taking a little longer was described 41 years ago by C. J. Rhodin, a San Francisco consulting engineer who exclaimed—"What a wonderful thing it would be for San Francisco if there were a rapid transit system where you could take an express train that would run, without grade crossings, to San Mateo and other points south." A year later, the San Francisco voters approved a charter amendment which would permit the development of the first rapid transit system. At a cost of 4 million dollars such an astronomical sum was deemed to be prohibitive and the first rapid transit plan was abandoned in 1923.

Through the years our individual communities slowly grew and prospered around the bay, loosely linked together by country roads, ferry boats, common friendships, and mutual admiration. Then virtually overnight something happened.

After World War II a disappearing act took place! The open lands, orchards, truck farms, dairies, country valleys and rolling hillsides vanished. In the past 20 years we have seen entirely new communities appear such as Pleasant Hill, Los Altos, Fremont, and other cities which were merely crossroads a few months or a few years ago. As if by magic, the Bay Area emerged from a series of cities, town, and villages into a metropolitan community with a physical oneness and unity comparable to any metropolitan city in the world.

There was no design for this startling and phenomenal development. The only clue we had was the predictions of the early explorers who foresaw the inevitability of growth and the natural unity of the area—plus the occasional predictions of a few farsighted leaders in intervening years.

The progress toward our metropolitan city is not just in physical terms of filling in the land gaps between communities—it exists in many of our daily concerns. Air and water pollution, regional parks, and the Bay Area Crusade are examples where we have recognized the area-wide nature of urban problems and have taken creative steps toward cooperative solutions.

* * *

In a real sense the land area around our Bay is rapidly becoming a regional metropolis, bound together by freeways, automobiles, communications, press, regional parks, common goals and interests.

How many of you live, work, play, worship, and send your children to school all in one county?

The automobile and our freeways have made it possible for all of us to be truly Bay-Area-Citizens. It isn't unusual to have a friend who lives in one community, works in another, shops in another, plays golf, worships, or sends his children to school in another county. The 3 and 4 county citizen is becoming quite common. When he vacations or travels to far off places and they ask him where he is from, he isn't quite certain which county to name, so he answers, "I'm from the Bay Area." The number of such citizens is growing rapidly and is creating a new regional civic consciousness, a new responsibility for the people of this area. They retain their traditional loyalties to their own city or county, but now interest themselves in events and developments in all areas of the Bay. It is not unusual to hear a citizen of San Francisco, Sonoma, or San Mateo County expressing his or her opinions about the new civic center in Marin, or Palo Alto, as though he had a vested interest in it.

We are noticing that more of our citizens of the Bay Area are now assuming the obligations and responsibilities that accompany their area-wide citizenship.

It is significant, as well as fortunate, that many of our business leaders recognize their important role in this vast urban complex. By their actions they have served notice they will not abdicate their citizenship responsibilities by expecting the development of this area to be accomplished by the next generation, or solely by dedicated and well-intentioned government employees. These leadership resources of our private sector represented by the Bay Area Council, are capable of unleashing tremendous forces which can carry this area to undreamed of heights.

This has many advantages because it makes possible the use of the private sector to assume responsibilities for new functions instead of our usual practice of forfeiting everything to the already overburdened public sector.

Equally significant among the many sponsors of this meeting is ABAG. This Association of Bay Area Governments has long been a dream of governmental leaders in this area. In its short history of three years, ABAG has been successful in bringing together the leaders of our Bay Area Governments to promote a finer metropolitan area.

Now for the first time with the existence of these two representative groups we enjoy a unique and unparalleled opportunity to bring together the total leadership resources of this entire area. Neither organization would be fulfilling its true purpose if it did not work with the other. Truly our destiny will be assured when our private and public sectors, represented by these two fine organizations, work, plan, and act together to accomplish our common goals and aspirations.

This meeting, we know, is the first conference of its kind on the 'future of the Bay Area.' Few of the men, and I'm sure none of the women, remember a similar gathering of 1,000 people which took place 35 years ago just six blocks away in the Hotel Oakland.

That was in 1927 when one of our early Bay-Area-Citizens, Fred Dohrman, undertook the stupendous job of arousing the whole metropolitan region of the Bay to the desirability of planning for orderly growth and development. Fred Dohrman accepted the leadership of the new Regional Planning Association and made it his personal crusade to awaken the people of the area to the new challenge of regional cooperation. After two years of great effort and frustration the Association was abandoned.

Notwithstanding this defeat the following story illustrates that the natural desires for cooperation were recognized in many quarters of the area.

If I, as City Manager, were to propose to the Oakland City Council that we donate \$50,000 of our taxpayers' money to Sonoma County so that they could buy land to build a 'space age' rocket base in their county—how do you think my City Council would react? My guess is that they would put me in the first rocket.

Strangely enough, however, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce used just that approach in the heart of the depression in 1931. Their President, Leland Cutler, said, "We appeal to our neighbors: San Jose, Oakland, Alameda, Berkeley, Palo Alto, San Mateo, and Marin County cities—all bay communities and corporations—to pledge one-half million dollars to purchase land. "NO-BODY FAILED US," said Leland Cutler, as he handed over a deed to the United States Navy for 1,000 acres to construct Moffett Field in Sunnyvale.

The Marin County Board of Supervisors, an alert group of gentlemen, immediately took heart in this cooperative approach. They wanted to give away 1,000 acres too, but their generosity exceeded their financial resources and they had to raise over \$50,000 from civic organizations and governments of San Francisco, Oakland, Sonoma County, and other communities to augment Marin tax funds with which they purchased the property which later became Hamilton Field. San Francisco pledged \$12,500; Oakland \$12,500; and Sonoma \$5,000—31 years ago this month they presented the deed to the Army.

A similar attitude prevailed a short time later when all nine counties joined together to provide a united front before the congressional committees exploring the possibilities of establishing a Naval Air Station in Alameda.

The formula, "all-for-one and one-for-all" has paid rich dividends.

Today we find that our annual military payroll in this area exceeds 800 million dollars, that the services and supplies purchased amounts to over one and one-half billion dollars—or a total well over two billion dollars a year. We find, therefore, that our Bay Area military installations are our greatest employer and purchaser. This is a dramatic testimonial to the unselfish, cooperative spirit existing here at that time.

It is also significant to note that in those early thirties we were long on bread lines and short on dollars.

We are all familiar with more recent attempts toward area-wide unity—transportation studies, water pollution, Bay Area Crusade, air pollution, and other areas.

But no matter how promising, these developments do not recognize that individual problems, like transportation, have a direct relationship to all other problems in the area. Likewise, the Reber plans, new bridges, shoreline developments, and other piece by piece approaches to specific problems of the Bay do not always provide for the best solution for any city or for the total future of the Bay.

I am sure it is quite apparent to all that nearly every single purpose approach conflicts with, injures, and sometimes destroys values in other areas or segments of our community. The unilateral handling of area problems, no matter how desirable the individual goal, is not the solution to the long-range growth of each of our communities, nor to the entire Bay Area metropolis.

Our future requires an area-wide long-range rather than a piecemeal single-interest approach.

In summary then, there are three significant differences between this 1963 meeting in the Oakland Kaiser Center and the 1927 meeting in the Hotel Oakland:

First, the need is more urgent,

Secondly, our Bay Area has grown into one economic unit; and

Lastly and most importantly—for the first time in our 200 year history, Bay Area leadership representing business, industry, and government is organized and is equal to the task which lies ahead.

This conference is particularly timely because the need for action now is essential.

As in all programs timing is important. To illustrate, let me suppose for a moment that the 50,000 years of mankind's recorded history were compressed into 50 years. This is how the timetable would read:

Ten years ago, man left his cave for other dwellings

Five years ago, writing was invented

Two years ago, Christianity appeared

Fifteen months ago, Gutenberg developed movable type

Ten days ago, electricity was discovered

Yesterday morning, the airplane was invented

Last night, the radio was introduced

This morning, television made its appearance

An hour ago, the electronic computer was invented.

In keeping with this timetable, our generation has only a few minutes left, so we had better move.

Let this conference today be the event that initiates a positive, decisive action for the Space Age metropolis of the Bay Area. We have the leadership and we have the resources—the need is urgent and the time is now. Today's Conference can and should provide the impetus.

HOW DO WE DO IT—

Let us propose the immediate formation of a working partnership of the Bay Area Council, the Association of Bay Area Governments, our Universities, and our Foundations to marshal our resources, ideas and energies. These, then, can be organized and harnessed to:

Take an inventory of our needs—to identify those common problems which are area-wide in scope;

Secondly—Do massive research—on a scale unmatched in our history;

Thirdly—Set area goals and objectives—that are long overdue; and Finally—Create the action structure needed to implement and carry on a mutually-developed program, comprehensive in scope, bold in design—to match the wonders of our great Bay Area.

The alternative is to ask, by default or otherwise, for a super agency of government—either state or federal—to solve the problems of our Bay Area. Let us—as dedicated Bay-Area-Citizens—set our own goals, determine our own course, and guide our own destiny.

In this age of space-stations and moon flights we can now utilize the technological spin-off from the Space effort. We will discover undreamed of solutions to urban problems. We represent the most richly endowed metropolitan area in the world. Consequently, we have a higher responsibility and the greatest opportunity to set the Space Age pattern for 'good living' for urban people throughout the world.

I am confident that you are about to witness in this decade the most electrifying and exciting transformation of an urban area in all history. This is the Herculean task which can be started and accomplished by the Bay Area team assembled here today.

LAWRENCE LIVINGSTON, JR.

President, Livingston & Blaney

Case in Point—The Bay as a Resource

When you think of San Francisco Bay, the first thing that comes to mind is the importance of the Bay in shaping this region. The 450 square mile Bay is, of course, its principal natural feature, and the large, sheltered harbor was the original impetus for its urbanization. Later, ferry boats on the Bay served as the principal mode of intra-regional transportation.

Many people don't realize it, but the Bay produces an extremely important natural resource; salt is our region's most valuable crop, measured on a yield per acre basis. It produces about \$10 million income a year. Mel Scott, who is currently making a study of San Francisco Bay for the University of California, Institute of Governmental Studies, has estimated that the annual economic return from the Bay itself is more than \$70 million. This includes minerals, sport fishing and hunting, and recreational boating.

Without the Bay, in my opinion, the metropolitan area would be only slightly more attractive than the Los Angeles Basin. To follow up what Wayne Thompson suggested, imagine the view from the Oakland-Berkeley hills, or San Francisco, or Marin County looking down upon the surface of the Bay if we had indeed dumped Los Angeles into it. Like the view from the Hollywood hills, it might be rather impressive at night, but not much to boast about by day.

The Bay has served to divide this region into physically distinct communities, and to my way of thinking, the advantages of this separation far outweigh the disadvantages. It is quite important, I believe, that each of the resulting urban subregions is of manageable size. The Bay has helped to prevent our metropolitan area from developing into a New York-type megalopolis, to use Louis Mumford's term. The resulting political and administrative problems are susceptible of solution if and when the public demands that they should be solved.

Now let's take a few minutes to think about what we have done to our Bay. Although we allow sewage to pollute it and we otherwise mistreat it, the Bay has been less violated than ignored. Except for ports and a few recreation facilities and residential areas, most

of our shoreline development has been designed and built as if it were a mile away or even 1,000 miles away from the water.

This is partly because much of the Bay shore is marsh land, and it lacks a clean, sharply defined edge. The harbors and the industrial and military installations have pre-empted much of the developed shoreline. There are relatively few locations where the people can make contact with the Bay. If you were to go this afternoon to Fisherman's Wharf, or to Jack London Square here in Oakland, to the Berkeley pier, or to Sausalito or Tiburon, I think the crowds you would see there are good evidence that there is great demand for more opportunities for contact with the Bay.

If they couldn't see it from the hills, many residents of this region would be scarcely conscious of the Bay.

Man has come to grips with the problems and potentials of the Bay in two major ways. Construction of the trans-Bay crossings, of course, is one. We've built five of them since the advent of the automobile. The other type of development, and the one which I want to discuss primarily today, is the fill projects. We have a great many of these. Most of them have proved to be assets and a few, perhaps, liabilities. Let me mention some of the most notable:

Downtown San Francisco east of Montgomery Street, of course, is a filled area. The development started shortly after the Gold Rush.

San Francisco's Marina district, which was filled for the 1915 Fair.

Hunter's Point Shipyard. Candlestick Park. South San Francisco's industrial lands. San Francisco Airport. San Mateo residential areas along the Bayshore Freeway.

The filling of Brewer Island just south of the San Mateo bridge now is in progress to create a site for the new planned Foster City.

Treasure Island. Oakland Army Base. Alameda Naval Air Station.

The recently filled Alameda South Shore. This was a sound idea. Unfortunately it was badly executed; and it is frequently cited as a horrible example by people who are opposed to additional Bay-fill projects.

Oakland Airport. Richmond harbor area.

San Rafael residential and commercial areas. Corte Madera residential development. Belvedere Lagoon, a deluxe residential area; and new high-priced waterfront subdivisions on the east side of Tiburon Peninsula.

Those of you who are familiar with the so-called "2020 Report," the United States Department of Commerce's survey done

for the Corps of Engineers four or five years ago, may recall that there are some statistics on reclamation of the Bay and some forecasts of what we can look forward to. The Department of Commerce points out that of the 568 square miles susceptible of reclamation (and in that category, it includes marshland, tidelands and submerged lands under less than one fathom) some 243 square miles have been reclaimed. It is important to bear in mind that of these 243 square miles, 225 were drained marshlands, and only 17 square miles have actually been filled in the technical sense of the word.

Of the total reclaimed land, about 190 square miles are devoted to agriculture, salt ponds, dumps, and recreation. The last are mostly duck clubs. These areas are protected by levees and they are not filled above the maximum high tide level. This is a relatively cheap method of fill compared with high level fill. The 53 square miles of reclaimed land that are devoted to urban uses are filled above maximum high tide level.

There are 325 square miles susceptible of reclamation remaining, according to the "2020 Report." Only 75 square miles of this total is marshland, mostly located at the far reaches of the Bay in the Suisun, Petaluma and Alviso areas. The remaining 250 square miles of tidelands and submerged lands are going to be relatively expensive to fill. For instance, engineering studies made for the Berkeley Waterfront plan in 1960 estimated the net cost per improved acre at from \$42,500 for parks to over \$60,000 for residential and industrial areas. By way of contrast, recent estimates for filling the Corte Madera marshlands in Marin County, are much lower—\$13,000 to \$23,000 an acre, depending upon the method of fill.

What plans have been made? What proposals have been put forward to change the Bay as we now know it? The Reber Plan, of course, is the most spectacular and controversial. You will recall that it called for the construction of tidal barriers to create fresh water lakes at the north and south ends of the Bay to be connected by a ship channel created by fill parallel to the East Bay shore. The lakes were to provide water supply and to solve the problems of salt water intrusion and flooding in the Delta area and the South Bay. The barriers were also to serve as vehicular and rail crossings.

Several studies indicated that there were aspects of the Reber Plan which made it impractical but that the barrier idea was worthy of further investigation. Consequently, the Corps of Engineers built an elaborate model of the Bay in Sausalito, and there a number

of tests have been made to determine the effects of barriers at various locations on tidal action, currents, silting, and other aspects of the Bay. A report on the studies of the Corps of Engineers is due to be published soon. (Ed. note: Due July, 1963.)

About five years ago Santa Clara County published an inspirational preliminary report showing elaborate residential and recreation development of the South Bay shoreline, including the construction of islands, all located on a fresh water lake behind a South Bay barrier. Since 1958 Santa Clara, San Mateo and Alameda counties, particularly their planning departments, have been discussing the need for a South Bay plan.

Almost 20 years ago, the Port of Oakland proposed an enormous industrial and port development in the North Harbor, lying just north of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, as well as a more modest scheme for San Leandro Bay. Neither of these plans has ever been carried out; presumably they are not yet financially justified.

More recently Richmond has published a report recommending tideland and reclamation studies for that city.

Berkeley has gone further than any other community on the Bay in investigating the feasibility of developing its tidelands. Engineering, economic and planning studies were made in 1960. The resulting preliminary plan called for the filling of about 2,000 acres of private and City tidelands for industry, expansion of the University of California campus, a junior college, a residential area, and recreation facilities. This plan generated powerful opposition from conservationists opposed to further filling of the Bay. This group calls themselves, I think quite aptly, Save the San Francisco Bay Association. It has raised aesthetic objections to fill projects, and it has questioned the wisdom of piecemeal planning.

Currently Alameda County and cities from the Richmond Bridge south to the Bay Bridge are considering the possibility of jointly sponsoring a plan for the East Bay waterfront.

Now I believe that the Save the Bay Association was quite correct in advocating that Bay planning should be done on a comprehensive rather than on a piecemeal basis.

At the present time the Association of Bay Area Governments proposes to prepare a regional plan for the Bay region. It is going to apply for federal financial aid which is available on a 2:1 matching basis, and shoreline planning is a high priority item in ABAG's regional planning program. However, after having been informed of the size of the budget for the first couple of years and even assuming a much larger sum could be spent, let's say over a five year

period, still it will probably be inadequate to make what I am sure will be the essential investigations in connection with Bay planning. These are detailed engineering studies to determine the feasibility and the cost of fill in each area. Simultaneously there are needed economic studies to determine the rate of absorption of filled land for various uses at the locations and at the prices indicated by the engineering investigations. Without these facts, a region-wide shoreline plan would be nothing but wishful thinking. It is essential to have a sound basis to judge the financial consequences of the planning decisions.

Many people fail to realize that much of the Bay that is subject to reclamation is in private ownership, and the owners have the right to fill their parts of the Bay for any use permitted by law. For example in Berkeley, the land that could be most economically filled, is not the City-owned tidelands but the private properties of the Santa Fe Railway and the Pacific Guano Company.

The Save the Bay Association may prevent the City from filling its tidelands, but essentially it cannot stop private owners. Regulations prohibiting filling or limiting the use of tidelands unreasonably would be confiscatory. The only way to prevent the filling of private tidelands or their use for urban development is to purchase them. Belvedere did this to prevent one project that the people didn't like. But for most cities and counties or on a significantly large scale, such a program would be financially impossible—even with the 30 percent federal aid which is now available under the Open Space Land Purchase Program.

Consequently, I think we must all face the fact that a workable way to prepare a meaningful plan for the future development and for the conservation of San Francisco Bay is needed. This is needed so that public resources can be expended to purchase those parts of the Bay that should be kept in open water—to be used for recreation or simply to look at. But, this must be done on a selective basis within our financial means. The owners of the portions of the Bay that are susceptible of reclamation are mainly cities, counties, private individuals and corporations; relatively speaking, the federal and state holdings are not large.

This morning I want to propose to this group that these public agencies and private owners jointly sponsor the preparation of a comprehensive plan for Bay development and conservation. This should include the engineering and economic studies that I have described as essential, as well as the planning studies. Preparation of the plan could be financed on the basis of some equitable formula, possibly with state and/or federal aid. Since Mr. Ylvisaker

will be our next speaker, perhaps I should mention the word "foundation" somewhere in here.

This procedure would be much less expensive for each owner than the individual studies that eventually are going to be needed, if each is going to find out whether his holdings can be developed in a financially feasible way, and so that the public can find out what parts of the Bay should be conserved as open water. These studies could be made at the same time as the ABAG-sponsored regional plan is being prepared, and a mutually beneficial exchange of information would result. A comprehensive regional plan would provide the essential framework for the Bay plan. While the research and analysis phases of the regional plan were in progress, the engineering and market studies for the Bay plan could be going ahead, and then the design phases of both plans could proceed more or less simultaneously.

Representing as it does both the private and public sectors, I believe the Bay Area Council would be a very logical official sponsor of a San Francisco Bay Plan, or it might be merely an unofficial instigator, as it was in the case of the up-coming Bay Area Transportation Study. SPUR, one of the sponsors of this morning's meeting, functioned in a similar role to bring together the owners and tenants of properties on Market Street in San Francisco and to get them rolling on the preparation of a privately sponsored plan, with public cooperation, for the improvement of that particular small but vital part of the Bay region.

All interests concerned with Bay development and conservation agree that a plan based on sound engineering and economic studies, as well as on considerations of long-range public interest, is absolutely essential. And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the only way we are going to obtain such a plan in the 1960's is through the cooperative public-private approach that I suggest.

PAUL YLVISAKER

Director of Public Affairs, Ford Foundation

Planning—Shaping Our Regional Growth and Development

In another generation—if your people multiply and our people move as they have—the Bay Area will be in numbers what the New York Metropolitan Region is today.

That could be an exciting prospect—for whatever you may feel about New York (and Californians, being now the most populous state in the Union, can afford to be generous)—the fact is New York is the liveliest and most powerful city of our age.

The prospect could also be a grim one. The New York region has enough gray rot at its inner core and enough garish green at its growing edges to give its own citizens considerable pause. And the same double danger signs are showing here as well.

The greatness of growth or the grimness? You in the Bay Area have no choice but to grow. What choice you do have, lies in the kind of growth you encourage, and in the shape you allow it to take.

The Sermon for Today is Regional Greatness through Regional Planning, and we chosen preachers have only until 4:15 p.m. to bring our audience to the faith. For if you in the Bay Area would only plan your future on a regional basis—so the good book says, and I am a true believer—you would grow into greatness.

But there's something so perfect about this line of argument that any alert member of the congregation is bound to ask two simple questions:

1. What really is this thing called Regional Planning?

2. If it's so wonderful, why then so many preachers and so few practitioners? For if we were to be honest about it, there isn't a metropolitan area in the country—and mighty few around the world—where regional planning is anything more than a fledgling without teeth, fed on the pabulum of charitable handouts and taxpayer hand-me-downs, loved for its innocence, and kept safely out of reach of anything thought dangerous or valuable.

Let's define our terms and go after this first question or what it really is we're talking about when we pray and preach for Regional Planning.

One can be satirical and call it escapism. This is implicit in one impudent definition of a region as an area safely larger than the last one for whose problems we couldn't find a solution.

And you can't too quickly dismiss this charge of escapism. Our shelves and experience are full of cases where tough decisions have been avoided or delayed by an appeal for study of a problem on a regional basis; full of instances where the buck has been passed up the line from existing levels with the capacity to act, to hypothetical levels with no power of action whatsoever.

But turn this satire on its back and you have pinned down a valuable truth. Regional Planning *is* in part a Myth and an Illusion—the invitation to think and to act as though there were a broader interest at stake than the ones which vote in your local elections. In most cases this broader interest will be undefined, and it will be your lonely job as one local government in a regional crowd to define it; this broader interest will be unrepresented, and it will be your thankless job—often against your own immediate interests—to speak on its behalf. The question of race and housing is one of these cases. Its resolution will come when individual suburbs and developments find the conscience and courage to do what morally ought to be done, but what is not yet required of them either by law or by their own internal pressures and politics.

To escape tough decisions or not to escape? The Regional Planning I'm talking about and preaching for is the opposite of escapism. But if it's escapism you choose, I would not want to be a Bay Area resident a generation hence. Nor will your children.

Regional planning can also be defined by the powers you assign it and the facilities you provide for it.

So far, our position in the U.S. is to engage in a massive conspiracy of caution, timidity and penny-pinching. Mostly, we make regional planning a private or semi-private undertaking, with the only power given it that of writing reports—which insures in advance the validity of the charge that the only place Regional Planning gets you is a dusty corner on a library bookshelf. When occasionally we make regional planning a governmental undertaking, it's either a "mistake" we never make again (like TVA), or a one-shot affair, like a regional transportation study; or a loose confederacy no one has to join and anyone can pick up his marbles and leave. I've often wondered what would happen to a business (say A T & T) that did its regional planning this way—through outsiders who had no power of decision, or just once in a while, or do-it-only-if-you-feel-like-it, and for-heavens'-sake-don't-spend-any-money-at-it.

To commit yourself or to play it cozy? The Regional Planning I'm talking about involves a deep and continuous commitment, and some real sacrifices. But if it's lip-service you choose, I would not want to be a Bay Area resident a generation hence.

Regional Planning can also be defined as a matter of timing.

To date, we've usually consigned regional planning to a post facto map-drawing exercise by technicians detached from too many of the public and private decisions that count. And before these planners even have a chance to fiddle, the region has been burned. Highways are built, utility lines spread, agricultural land speculated, housing developments sited and sold, transportation vehicles designed and marketed, population sorted out by income and color, factories located, schools built, shopping centers assembled, cemeteries laid out, mass transit abandoned, water drained off, roadsides commercialized—and then in holy horror we pray for regional planning. Like salvation, regional planning is appreciated mostly by those who have lost their chance at it. Too little, too late; a cry of repentance rather than a decision not to sin.

To anticipate or to repent: The Regional Planning I'm talking about is action beforehand, not regrets and short-lived resolutions afterward. But if it's a wake the Bay Area is planning, don't count on my children or yours to be on hand a generation hence. There'll be happier spots elsewhere they'll be moving to.

Finally, Regional Planning can be defined in terms of those invited to take part.

As you know, regions are made up of many diverse and competing interests, some of them more powerful and articulate than others. Seldom have we seen a representative effort at regional planning, with a reasonable cross-section of the community drawn actively into the process. More often it's a self-chosen group which sets itself up to do business. Their motives may be irreproachable, but their work is limited from the start by the narrowness of their base. For good and bad reasons, those who are not represented adopt a hostile or indifferent attitude. And for understandable reasons, those who made the initial effort out of altruism, trim their original program to the specific things their membership has an immediate interest in and competence to achieve. Soon regional planning of comprehensive goals and noble ambitions degenerates into "I've got mine, now you get yours."

One for all or all for one? The Regional Planning I'm hoping for is a common search for the common interest. But if it's to be the old game of self-advantage under the banner of the public interest, then the Bay Area of a generation hence won't have much appeal—I trust—to your children or to mine.

So much for the Sermon. Now what about some of the realities that make everyday practice so damnably different and more difficult than we preachers would have it?

One is that we still haven't defined Regional Planning in workable terms—it's still more talk than technique. And in many ways it must always be. For between the map-drawing and data-gathering that now is the hallmark of regional planning, and the myriad of major and minor decisions which every day keep us alive, stretches a vast area of uncertainties and unknowns. We all move in this area by guess, by grace, and by God.

Experience in this area of the unknown makes any sane man—and certainly any decision-maker, public or private, but especially the politician—a pragmatist. Ringing in his ears will be Chester Barnard's world-weary but experienced statement, that the best test of efficiency is survival.

Barnard was right, but he was also wrong. Survival in the area of the urban unknowns is no mean accomplishment. But it is a measure of the past, not of the future; an invitation to stand on safe ground, to hang on to by-gones.

Growth—which is your destiny—lets no man stand where he is; he must run even to keep up. There are any number of examples on the current urban scene one could point to. Technology is an obvious case in point; our host city of Oakland is demonstrating the need to keep up by the conference it will shortly stage on "Space, Science and Urban Life." Ten years ago, anyone who would have proposed such a conference would have been thought mad. Yet when the Bay Area now is on the verge of committing hundreds of millions to a new mass transit system, I am sure you quietly wish that a "madman" a generation ago had provoked the community into continuous research and development on the technology of transportation beyond the familiar shapes of railways and automobile.

Another example of accelerating change now being thrust upon us is that of social change and the need for social planning of a sort far different than we have ever recognized. Twenty years ago, the National Resources Planning Board—and the Land-Use Planning movement in agriculture—were hatched by a Congress aroused over the concern shown by these pioneering efforts for the full development, conservation and use of human resources. Today we wish we had the benefit of those missing twenty years of thought and experience in facing the challenge and problems presented by the growing minority population of our older cities and suburbs. These problems will not be resolved by traditional methods. The meaning of freedom and opportunity have sunk too deep into the consciousness of these people and into the conscience of the majority to let this be a matter of unilateral charity or multi-lateral neglect. Yet how to extract ourselves from the dependency system into which we have been led by charity, and how to encourage the

growing pride of these people of formerly low estate to take positive rather than only negative form, are questions whose answers require our living with the future rather than the past. Again, it is impressive to see our host city of Oakland tackling directly the job of social planning which too many of our cities have dodged. Before long, if Oakland is to have any success in its experiment, it must be joined by the entire Bay region. For no city is a social island, nor is any suburb. To resolve a social problem of this magnitude, requires concerted thought and action in every sector of the region, and for that matter, in every section of the country. Oakland is a symbol and a start, not a final solution.

These two examples of planning, technological and social, underscore the necessities and the uncertainties we deal with. Contrary to going impressions of what planning stands for, they do not call for doctrinaire statements of what to do and how to do it, under conditions of centralized authority. On the contrary, they invite the pragmatic, the experimental, the specific, the immediate, and the attitude of let's-start-where-we-are and by starting encourage others to join us.

But more than that, these examples invite a commitment—continuously, by all elements in the regional community and not merely by hired technicians—with attention to the problems that matter, and the means necessary to make a difference.

We can admit that Regional Planning does not have the answers. But that does not mean avoiding the commitment.

The most successful preachers leave it with generalities. But perhaps rashly, I'd like to close with some specifics. They stand as an answer—or at least the beginning of an answer—to a question I've quietly asked myself after rereading some of my own generalities: "What would stand as a commitment to Regional Planning which a voter could vote for, a politician could defend, a businessman could help pay for, and a man at the bottom of the totem pole could say might also be in his interest?" Which is asking a lot—as follows:

1. That the State follow and extend the emerging practice of the federal government in shaping its grants to encourage regional planning and action. One way of doing this might be to double or even triple grants-in-aid for those projects which were worked out on a regional basis—from sewage systems to school construction, from urban renewal to youth development.

2. That the metropolitan region create (or otherwise make provision for) a regional research, development and experiment station to help formulate and test out programs of regional scope.

Also that public and private employment systems provide research and educational leaves for staff to participate in the work of such an institution.

3. That the metropolitan area institute an annual Report on the State of the Region, comparable in its economic coverage to the annual reports of the President and his Council of Economic Advisers, but also including such data as social change and mobility. This report to be backstopped by a regional system of data gathering and processing.

4. That the metropolitan area establish a regional training institute for professional and other key governmental employees, and for elected public officials.

5. That the universities and colleges of the metropolitan area sponsor a continuing seminar on the region and its problems, for policy-level persons in both the private and public sectors.

6. That continuous studies be made of future industrial technology, employment requirements, and other forces likely to assert an influence on the shape of the region, and that these be directly related to decisions affecting land use, vocational education, industrial location, etc.

7. That the separate governments in the metropolitan area set aside at least one council meeting each year to consider the regional context in which they are doing business, and to invite to these meetings the elected heads of surrounding municipalities.

8. That such costs as are involved in these and other regional undertakings be shared on some proportionate basis, and that they be levied automatically rather than be subject to the changing fancy of individual municipalities.

You may find these specifics not to your taste or condition.

But whatever specific you choose, the time has come to do something more than titillate ourselves with innocuous generalities.

For the problems we face in our metropolitan areas are not going to be licked with generalities. The commitments we require will have no force if expressed only in general terms. The answers we search for will not come by forever contemplating the urban universe.

The Bay Area—through the enlightened leadership who have called this Conference, in establishing the Association of Bay Area Governments, in its measures for controlling air pollution and improving mass transit—has done more than talk about its regional problems. But I am sure you will agree, there is a long way to go and much to be done if growth is to be channelled by this region into greatness.

ROY SORENSON

Chairman, Governor's Commission on Metropolitan Area Problems

Government—Managing Regional Affairs

The Bay Area may be in many respects, an entity: a physical, social, economic and urban entity. But it is not a governmental or political entity. The metropolitan area is not a monolithic interest, a single community, but neither is it an unrelated collection of many fragments. Between the invalid extreme of seeking a metropolitan government as though we were a single community and the equally invalid extreme of trying to cope with the present scale of urban life with an unfederated proliferation of governments, lies a huge arena for concern and creativity.

This is a very sensitive area. The forces resisting change are strong, reinforced by traditional American political thought which believes that democracy is best in small geographic units.

Yet the scale of living has changed. What is local, what is "home" and what is "rule" has changed radically within the metropolis. Questions we raise about government in the Bay Area may be among the most important ones we must answer. For they bear upon the ability or inability of government to shoulder the burden of decision, to manage regional affairs.

I—GOVERNMENT IN THE BAY AREA: WHAT WE HAVE

A bird's eye view of the *metropolitan government structure* looks down upon nine counties and 85 incorporated cities. Not so visible to a bird's eye are the 800 special districts piled up across incorporated and unincorporated territory. Much of this results from laws enacted when California was largely rural. The legal requirements for incorporation are very lax (an area only needs 500 people—there is no other requirement).

Special purpose cities have been incorporated for reasons that have little to do with a well rounded municipality, much more in the south than in the Bay Area. The shape and size of cities leave much to be desired. And the indiscriminate formation of special districts has produced overlapping layers of single purpose units.

Unincorporated areas are poorly organized and ill-equipped to deal with problems of urban growth. Here are where "slurbs" creep.

Annexation processes are inadequate because of law, public-private utility conflict, and selective practices which take the best

of the fringe, leaving the rest with lower tax base unsuitable for incorporation and undesirable for annexation.

Special districts, which can tax and borrow, are one of the major methods used by local government to meet the demand for services. The variety is almost as great as the tasks which local government performs. Citizens of an unincorporated area may pay taxes to six or eight special districts with little control over them, yet they help shape their neighborhoods. District elections don't interest voters who don't know how many districts they are in. Yet districts determine policy, prevent district consolidations or dissolution and have been known to block annexation or incorporation proposals. They violate home rule, by-pass the local political process and contribute much to the continuing fragmentation of local government.

The only forms of regional or metropolitan government are single-purpose districts for parts of the Bay Area. These include the East Bay Municipal Utility District, created 40 years ago; the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; the East Bay Regional Park District, created in 1934; the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District; the Bay Area Air Pollution District in five counties; and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District, formerly with five counties, now comprising three. The only nine county district is the Regional Water Pollution Control District, part of the state-wide system of water pollution districts. Is there significance in the fact that the only nine county governmental structure did not evolve *from within* the region but *from without*, as part of a state-wide system?

Another part of the picture not readily seen from a bird's eye view of the Bay Area is the many programs of state and federal government. Local governments look to these state and federal programs as the other major way to solve their problems.

More than four million dollars in *state* "local assistance" and capital outlay money will be spent by Bay Area *local* governments in 1962-63. This for education, health, hospitals, streams and air pollution, road and highway construction, recreation and other things. And, in effect, the State Highway Commission is the metropolitan freeway authority.

Nobody knows the total resources and powers of the federal government in the Bay Area. But we do know that they control land for defense installations, erect buildings, develop harbors and rivers, provide funds for highways, urban renewal, public housing in cities and F.H.A. in suburbs.

State and federal taxing powers have given rise to a gigantic grant-in-aid system which is a way to compensate for the inadequate

local revenue base. Also, when so many governments remain uncoordinated, the people's usual reaction is to look up to state and federal authority.

This is a major change in local government. One wag observed that we witness a situation in which local government preaches 19th century community self help while reaching for 20th century subsidies. Vidich and Bensman, in *Small Town and Mass Society*, suggest that the less the towns control their own political destiny, the more they talk about the virtues of home rule.

Municipalities in the Bay Area have traditionally gone their own way, making their own separate and uncoordinated plans, establishing their own conflicting zoning laws, setting their own varying assessment rates and competing with their neighbors for the location of favored industrial plants, a state college or a federal defense installation. So the whole area is shaped by thousands of separate and unrelated private and public decisions.

As these separate governments try to provide the services which people want they are plagued by growing hardships: lack of money, increase in burdens of government and lack of channels for coordination between neighboring governments.

And there are regional affairs to manage.

II—WHAT NEEDS MANAGING IN REGIONAL AFFAIRS: THE TASKS AHEAD

1. There are *symptoms of public discomfort*: traffic congestion and shortage of parking space in central cities; increasing jams and delays for commuters in peak hours; strains on water supply in some areas; expense of sewage disposal in suburban, rural-urban fringe developments; trash collection and sites for disposal; enormous increase in school costs; smog; public clamor for amenity: "Save the Bay," "Save the Foothills," stop the freeway, stop a high rise apartment, multiple dwelling or zoning change; and others you can think of. The causes and remedies for most of these discomforts are beyond the scope of small, individual governments.
2. There are *regional services* that require some kind of area-wide organization: regional planning and land use; mass transportation by rail, rubber, air and water; flood control; prevention and control of air and water pollution; disposal of garbage and refuse; regional parks. The most pressing and most hotly debated of these right now are regional planning and transportation. Land use planning must be done within a larger context.

Every city is handicapped by uncertainty about plans of outlying areas. The variety of industrial, commercial and residential development must be supplied within the total metropolitan area and not within any single jurisdiction. We are planning now, but in small confines which plan for more of what we've already got—uncontrolled urban sprawl and more problems for the future.

3. Local services now require broader cooperative planning. A small area considers creating a sewer district when the real question may be how a broader area could deal with a cluster of water supply, sanitary sewage and run-off problems. One school district wants to do something about its exceptional or slow children when only a broadened base could provide enough exceptional or slow students to organize practically. Many local services could benefit from having certain services provided on an area-wide basis, such as central police records and fingerprint files, police and fire training and communications, and central health laboratories.
4. And, of course, there are problems of *money and tax equity*. Central cities' populations cost more in welfare and police problems than their share of the taxes. They provide more of the area-wide facilities, which are removed from tax rolls. Suburbs have problems, too. An industrial plant which provides jobs for thousands of suburban workers may pay taxes only to the little village in which it stands. Its work force may double the school enrollment of a neighboring city to which the plant pays nothing.

Suburban municipalities vary greatly in the amount and quality of services provided. While some municipalities may be rich, many others are already levying higher taxes than the central cities and providing poorer services. Tax inequities within the Bay Area result from fixed boundary walls. People seem willing to go to Sacramento for help but are unwilling to go for a county-wide school tax.

5. A most crucial task to manage within the region is the *coordination of local, state and federal programs in the Bay Area*.

Some people look to the federal government to coordinate their programs in the Bay Area. They point to programs that may work in contradictory directions. The Urban Renewal Administration is dedicated to the elimination of slums, yet it often appears that the Federal Housing Administration is subsidizing the slums of the future. Federal funds build arterials, con-

tributing to outward development while Urban Redevelopment spends millions in rebuilding central cities.

Others press for coordination in state programs within the Bay Area: highways, bridges, public works, water resources, recreation and the others.

Undoubtedly increased coordination of state and federal programs, as they affect the Bay Area would be helpful. We now suffer from what Ernest Fisher has called "projectitis."

The fact is, however, that local, state and federal coordination in a region will only be achieved by regional initiative. Major blame for the ways our urban areas have grown can be laid right at the door of the municipalities themselves. To look to state and federal government to do the coordinating is, in effect, to ask them to take over the job of planning the physical destiny of our great cities and suburbs. The strongest argument for regional planning and action by local government is to be seen in the effects of partial and unplanned action from above—a regional counterforce to those now doing the planning and shaping the environment from outside. The right and responsibility of citizens to plan for the growth and development of their own living environment in today's and tomorrow's world must be exercised in the whole urban-metropolitan complex.

Here, if ever, is where local-state-federal coordination can take place. The only hope for influencing outside forces, be they federal, state, special districts or even another municipality, lies in abandoning the policy of "going it alone" in favor of joint plans and actions which deal with problems that are regional, rather than purely local in nature.

6. All of the other tasks of region depend upon some processes for *determining what we want as a whole*. What kind of a Bay Area community are we trying to build? Are present actions producing future problems? We know what irritates us: we know less well what is possible and what we want. Decision makers, private and government, must plan and act without any consensus about future images, or without even knowing what various images are possible. The Bay Area as we have known it cannot be preserved. Growth continually changes what was and what is. The issue is, can we shape that growth toward a Bay Area we want, rather than merely adjust to the haphazard result from myriads of unguided forces from within and from without the area? To come anywhere near getting what we may want we must have some images of what might

be. People aren't interested in planning or governmental arrangements as such: only as they glimpse what might be possible for the area as a whole do they become willing to put up with the planning and the changes required to get there. There is no governmental machinery in the Bay Area now responsible for creating or even thinking about images for the future and for engaging the political and educational processes whereby consensus emerges.

Thus the regional tasks are many: relief of public discomfort, regional services, broader cooperation in providing local services, tax equity, coordinating local, state and federal programs in the region and achieving consensus about what we want the Bay Area to be.

III—BLOCKS TO REGIONAL GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION: THE DIFFICULTIES

There are formidable blocks to change and progress which realism requires to take into account.

1. There is far more *competition, rivalry and diversity among Bay Area governments and peoples* than there is common loyalty and recognition of common interests. There still is a great deal of pride and some isolationism in large cities; and in the suburbs there is distrust of the large neighbors and a drive for self-sufficiency and independence. Central cities have become more "non-white," "foreign born," "blue collar" and "Democrat." The residential suburbs and new growth areas tend to be "middle and upper class white," "protestant," "Republican." Differences in kinds of governments, kinds of population and kinds of problems do not make regional cooperation any easier. Mutual suspicion between central cities and suburbs even becomes a political platform for aspirants to office, yet both segments are interdependent and neither could exist without the other.
2. The *political system* has its built-in opposition and mobilizes itself against change. Incumbents become vested interests for their jurisdictions, be they small special districts, regional districts or municipalities.
3. The historical political values of Americans condition them to accept "*home-rule*" as meaning the smallest geography or the status quo, the trouble being that what is "home" and what is "rule" has not yet been translated in terms of present day reali-

ties. There is nothing wrong with home-rule that a redefinition of home won't cure.

4. Some *myths* have become powerful. "Metropolitan super-government" is the phrase used to defeat bills to create planning districts and to discredit any and all regional governmental efforts. The word "super" is loaded and the words "metropolitan government" are used to conjure up the image of one big metropolitan government, something which none of the Bay Area people who are working for stronger regional muscles advocates or wants. "Another layer of government" is another phrase which causes tax-payers to cringe. These same citizens let special districts pile up layer on layer without a cry. When someone advocates creating order by reducing the number of special districts by some combination, the effective weapon is to label the proposal another "layer" of government.

In some circles the very word "metropolitan" is considered subversive. Politically, it is smarter to talk about "region." Because of these myths any proposal for reform is apt to be shot down as one of those "super-metropolitan" schemes before it is even understood.

Yet the American genius is to create and adapt its political institutions to meet new conditions. Rigidity and unwillingness to innovate are what seal us in the museum of urban past. This is un-American.

5. The largest block of all is *lack of public education*. If the public concept of the good life in the metropolis is narrow and impoverished, our plans and actions will be also. Public education for regional understanding and commitment, while growing, is not strong. The flood of good literature on the subject is read primarily by political scientists and planners, not by the general public. Those who have organized and sponsored this conference, along with notable others, have worked at it, but our voices haven't been heard by many.

The issues are complex, they come in bits and pieces, out of context. No governmental body in the region exists, except as ABAG may grow into it, where the broader issues can be raised.

Also this is not an easy era in which to arouse interest in local affairs. International news and outer space provide the drama of the day. These compete with pressing issues of urban environment, yet for peoples abroad their ultimate judgment about democracy may depend far more upon how we handle our urban affairs than whether we reach the moon.

IV—PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS—ACTION POSSIBLE NOW

What can we do now? What is the strategy for progress in 1963? Much can be done, the possibilities are many, if we don't shoot for a packaged solution to all problems.

1. First we can accept, be comfortable with and work with a *philosophy of change which fits the facts*. That is, one of gradualism, evolution, experimental step-at-a-time development: reaping an occasional break-through. What we need is a change of mind about government in the region, not a finished plan; bridges to the future rather than tables of governmental reorganization. We work for partial victories where they can be had. "The difficult we can do today; the impossible takes a little longer."
2. Second, we can start down some *pathways to regional organization*. The Association of Bay Area Governments, ABAG, is one such pathway which merits our support. The Association was created in 1961. True it is regrettable that San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda County and Solano County chose not to affiliate. Also true, it began with very limited forum and advisory functions. However, ABAG has gathered strength. It went to work on important matters through committees: on regional recreation, regional transportation, regional planning, air pollution control, uniform standards and multi-purpose districts. By October of 1962 the General Assembly approved recommendations of its Regional Planning Committee that it undertake responsibility for regional planning, maintain a small staff for this purpose and apply for a 701 Federal Urban Planning Grant. The significance of this action is that for the first time a Bay Area agency, with legal power to do so, has assumed responsibility for regional planning and will hereafter constitute itself the body to continue permanently the regional planning process.

We can work to get San Francisco, Oakland and the other missing governments into the fold. We can support the leadership for positive action within ABAG.

Another pathway to regional organization could be regional planning districts. Should such a bill be introduced and include provisions to recognize planning under the joint powers agreement as in ABAG, I believe we should support it. Later on I believe that multi-purpose districts may offer another evolutionary regional pathway. It was proposed in the last session and did not get out of committee. The proposal was ahead of

its time. More steps must be taken before the need and backing for multi-purpose regional districts will be strong enough to create them.

3. Third, there are some *pathways toward strengthening local government* which might be taken in this session of the legislature. It is time to change the ridiculous 500 population incorporation standard to a graduated one based upon total county population. A Local Agency Formation Commission is needed to review and approve or disapprove proposals for the incorporation of cities and the creation of special districts, to adopt standards and procedures for the evaluation of proposals for the creation of local government units and to study and make recommendations concerning state law affecting the creation of cities and special districts. The Committee on the Future of the League of California Cities recently reported that "existing laws concerning local boundaries are confusing, contradictory and archaic, and call for complete review and overhaul at the earliest possible moment of existing laws concerning annexation, incorporation and the establishment, alteration and abandonment of special districts." A bill to deal with annexation reforms is also needed. This will be more difficult. It is easier to deal with cities and districts yet unborn than to change boundaries of those now in existence. Bills to change the population requirement for incorporation of cities and to create a local agencies formation commission are of tremendous importance if we are to stem the further weakening of local government under pressures of population growth.
4. There are pathways toward the *coordination of transportation*, chiefly the bill for a Bay Area Total Transportation Study growing out of the Bay Area Transportation Coordinating Committee, the sequel to several of the previous proposals for a Golden Gateway Transportation Authority.
5. And fifth, there are *pathways to continuing attention to urban policy by local and state government*. Some method of institutionalizing a focus on urban problems and policies by state government with a permanent body uniting local and state interests in a new and exciting manner, could be an important pathway to progress. This is needed to identify and analyze urban trends and problems, to develop long range policies to assist the state and local governments in meeting the problems, and to inform the Governor and make recommendations to both state and local governments concerning policies and program.

6. *Six, there are pathways to state planning which affect regions.* The State Office of Planning has undertaken a State Development Plan, started in 1962, with a meager budget (less than half a million dollars), two-thirds from the Federal Government and the State's third is mainly for a state-wide small craft harbor study that the Division of Small Craft Harbors was having prepared. Small as it is, this is a start, and we must be grateful for small beginnings. This points up, however, California's need for a permanent state planning staff of a calibre and a size in scale with the job of preparing the development plan. The Director of Planning should be moved from the Department of Finance to the Governor's Office with cabinet status, appointed rather than Civil Service. The state must designate urban expansion areas; lands to be conserved for agriculture, recreation and scenic open space, a comprehensive transportation network and a state-wide water and flood control system.
7. *The final pathway is to step up public education.* This conference, which I hope may be the first of many, and the other activities of the organizations which sponsor this conference can help focus public attention upon our common life and problems in the Bay Area. The emerging citizens' groups for regional action should be encouraged and supported. Candidates for local offices and the state legislature should be questioned about their attitudes toward ABAG, regional planning, coordination of local-state-federal programs in the region and regional services. The quality of political debate on these matters, if upgraded, would help public understanding. And we can then back and vote for those candidates who are enlightened on regional matters.

This list of action possibilities could go on. It is not exhaustive, but illustrates some of the more important ways of strengthening Bay Area Government to manage regional affairs.

The job is to build bridges to the future: with and between units of government, such as ABAG, with and between state and federal agencies, with special districts, between the variety of technical people including planners and between private groups, such as the Bay Area Council, SPUR, the cooperating organizations in this conference, the Bay Area Welfare Council and many civic and business organizations.

And with better bridges we may construct a limited Bay Area governmental machinery by consolidating functions, by transferring them to more territorially extensive units, by jointly administering

them, and by creating new varieties of special or multiple districts and authorities. The means of achieving cooperation for regional action on regional problems are almost unlimited. The Bay Area must find that way best suited to itself.

Our type of democracy does not provide easy ways out. Developing more viable political institutions for dealing with the vast Bay Area turns upon political evolution. We need more people helping to achieve that political evolution and fewer people blocking it.

The central question is a big one: Is there still a chance for Bay Area people to program and plan the region's future amidst recurring changes of scale? This is a question worth asking and the answer will depend upon government's ability to manage regional affairs.

HON. JOHN HOULIHAN

Mayor of Oakland

Welcoming Remarks

Wayne Thompson's description of Oakland, the population center of this area, the new growth area, and as you look about you, the "jewel" city, needs no embellishment from one who is as much in love with Oakland as I am. As the good host, however, I will follow custom. I will try in the next few moments to make a presentation to the principal guests. Certainly to Stan McCaffrey for his leadership in the San Francisco Bay Area Council, to the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal group and even to ABAG.

It is our boast here in this community that we are not competitive but rather a complimentary component community to this great metropolitan area. And this morning, in this holy season of Lent, the Mayor of Oakland has been moved spiritually by the remarks of the Very Right Rev. Paul Ylvisaker, who departed quite conveniently from his prepared sermon and apologized only to say, by way of explanation, which is all an apology amounts to, that he was prompted to this departure by reason of his having sat next to me for just a few moments. I did not know that my own quiet presence would stir him to such great heights of oratory. Nevertheless, as one would to Saint Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, and I might say, aided and abetted by his prophet from our own country, Roy Sorenson, I was certainly inspired by the ecumenical exhortation. Therefore, I am prepared to make this presentation. I am about to confess the obstinancy of my past and the willingness to amend my ways in the future.

Consequently, I am prepared to recommend and will do so to the budget committee and the budget session of the Oakland City Council, meeting within the next few weeks, that the City of Oakland join the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Lest any of my Oakland constituents think that I have taken complete leave of my political senses, I would like to say that I have been encouraged by the remarks of Mr. Sorenson this morning, who certainly handled the matter on a very practical basis; he did express the reservations which the Mayor of Oakland and certainly the Mayor of San Francisco entertained; and I can't speak for Alameda, but certainly as far as I am concerned the reservations which we had entertained for some considerable time about the Association of Bay Area Governments would certainly be the conditions that I would recommend as precedent to our entry into

this Association. First, an absolute and total abandonment of any concept of the Association as a Society for the Further Preservation of Home Rule; and, secondly, to implement the work, a dedication to surrender of some sovereignty. If this is going to be modeled after the United Nations, it can only succeed on this latter principle.

Again may I return now to sweetness and light and say "Welcome," to the population center of Northern California. We know that with this first concrete contribution to this conference there will be others throughout the day. We look forward to success and working with all of our neighbors in this Bay Area.

Thank you.

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN

Principal Address

If California is the last frontier—and it is—the Bay Area must be the fortress in which man will stand up to the challenge of the city.

Lewis Mumford has said that in this particular battle, it is all too easy to get lost in the details of political organization, economic support, population movements and transportation. It is easy to neglect the factor that is central to all these things: people.

Cities are not civic centers or planning maps, but men, women and children. It is not the city that suffers from smog but people. It is not the cities that are cheated by de facto segregation, but the minority child who has a schoolhouse door slammed in his face.

As the thorough and incisive analyses made by the delegates to this conference have shown, it is a temptation to look at the growth figures, and the problems they engender, and then throw up your hands.

Those of you who have fought a losing battle to have beautiful public buildings, or to save the mint, or to return the ferries to the Bay, may feel you have reason to be discouraged.

And when somebody tells you that California is adding a new resident every minute, or a city the size of Oakland every year, you may feel even more seriously distressed.

That is just how you do feel when you see the pockets of luxury side by side with poverty; the pressure cookers of crime near old central business cores; the almost bankrupt new suburbs that cannot provide efficient services to the rows and rows of new homeowners.

But my theme today is that people caused these breakdowns and people can cure them. In particular, the people gathered here in this room.

If there is any other region in the nation that can outpace you for effective civic consciousness, its light is well hidden.

Organizations like the Bay Area Council, ABAG and SPUR; individuals like Gene Lee, Stan Scott, Will Smith, Mel Scott and Larry Livingston; industrial leaders like Edgar Kaiser and Steve Bechtel; academic centers like the University of California's Institute of Governmental Studies—all these are lively proof that California still has pioneers.

Speaking as Governor, my wish today is to affirm the intention of the state to encourage your efforts—to cooperate with you—to place the resources of the state at your disposal.

We recently welcomed the opportunities you gave us to do that; first, through the Transportation study, for which the prospectus has been completed and followed up by Senator McAteer's bill to authorize the Department of Public Works to conduct its study. And second, we were pleased to cooperate with the Bay Area Council and Stanford Research Institute in working on a comprehensive study of the Bay Area economy. Those who have had an advance look, incidentally, say that the prognosis looks very favorable.

The concern you feel should be the concern—not just of the 4 million residents of the nine Bay Area Counties—but of every one of our more than 17 million Californians.

You can draw up a balance sheet for the Bay Area.

You can say: These are our assets—a center for transportation, good employment, good local government, expanding industries, a center of culture, outstanding universities and colleges, unmatched natural beauty, a melting pot for people of all races, religions and nations.

Then you can draw up the debit column: Traffic breakdown, isolated minorities, segregated housing with small opportunity for low-income residents of any race to break through the economic barriers in housing; growing danger of air pollution, growing concern about crime and delinquency, growing unease with the disappearance of old and cherished landmarks.

And then you could cross "Bay Area" off the balance sheet and relabel it "California." The Bay Area is not an island.

Throughout our state, the question has gnawed at Californians: In 1970—in 1980—will California be green and golden?

There has been a growing knowledge that the answer will be yes if, and only if, we have the vision to shape an orderly future today and the courage to work for it.

And that means the people whom we elect to office—the people whose voices are raised in the community—must be the best equipped, the most imaginative and strongly motivated; not the cast-offs, the security seekers or the disinterested.

There is no easy way out. Where we set our transit systems, highways and freeways; where we place our living areas, parks and industries; how well we manage our God-given natural resources; how fiercely we fight to build the strength of the core of the city—all these things will spell our future success. Or lack of it.

But expressing concern is not enough. We must translate what we know and feel into action.

When I took office four years ago, I said that bold planning is the soundest guide for action. Wherever we looked, we found ample need for both.

We moved quickly to meet a massive set of challenges—a set so massive that we had to give priority to the most urgent issues.

We drew a master plan to guide the expansion of colleges and universities in California which must double their enrollments in this decade.

We drew a 12,000-mile, 20-year highway construction program, the first of its kind in the nation. More recently, we have outlined a 5,000-mile scenic highway system.

We began regional planning for hospital construction to avoid wasteful duplication; expanded the State Office of Planning and completed a long-range recreation plan.

And we also turned our attention to the cities—to the problems that concern you here today; to the search for solutions; to the effort to improve the relationship between the levels of government. My Commission on Metropolitan Area Problems made pioneer recommendations which set the stage for the breakthroughs that must inevitably be made by American cities.

This year, we are moving to make many of those breakthroughs.

In California this year we became the first state to recognize the increasing importance of city and county problems by meeting this problem head on.

I have established in my office a one-man Office of Urban Area Problems. Sherrill Luke of my staff, the former assistant city manager of Richmond, has been given the task of coordinating activities involving the Governor's Office and urban affairs.

He will work with city and county officials to coordinate urban policy; incorporation and annexation proceedings, regional planning, capital improvement programming, transportation, housing, human rights, conservation and proposed legislation affecting local government.

He will also work closely with the State Office of Planning, which is now preparing a State Development Plan to integrate the massive public works programs of the State with capital outlay plans of the cities and counties.

That is the first step in our 1963 program to lend the full weight of the State to the efforts of civic organizations—and the cities and counties—to solve the problems of urban areas.

Today, I want to propose that you join us in an intensive drive to lick those problems. We ask that you join in an Alliance for Urban Progress in California—a new means to bring about the increased cooperation between state and local government, and to encourage the participation of men, women and children throughout the state.

Let me add quickly that (if you are reminded of the OAS) we don't mean to equate the cities and counties with underdeveloped countries—far from it. We are talking about a joining of units of government and people, for the good purpose of bringing new vitality and strength to our cities and counties.

Here are the steps which we propose to take at the 1963 legislative session:

1. *We will ask the Legislature to create a Coordinating Council on Urban Policy, similar in concept to the existing Coordinating Council on Higher Education.*

The Council would be made up of balanced representation of state, county and city government and the public.

It will be charged with defining the roles of these levels of government in such areas as housing, urban renewal and redevelopment, transportation and rapid transit, air pollution, regional parks and recreation, public health and welfare, waste disposal and water pollution, water, natural resources and conservation.

The Council will then develop long range policies to assist the state and local agencies by recommending specific actions by the Governor.

2. *We will ask the Legislature to establish at the state level a Local Agencies Formation Commission, with quasi-judicial power to review the feasibility of proposed incorporations and district formations before any other legal steps can be taken.*

California suffers from too much government. And the overlapping agencies breed waste and inefficiency as surely as slums breed crime.

Yet there is no law to curb such abuses of home rule as the formation of cities solely to avoid taxes on industrial property. Nor is there any law to prevent a bedroom community—from incorporating without an adequate tax base.

The new commission—functioning independently of the Governor's Office or any state agency—would have the power to conduct public hearings. It could approve or disapprove an application for the formation of a city or district. It would have teeth in it.

Let me emphasize that the commission would not exist to prevent the creation of all new cities or districts—only those which are poorly conceived in the first place.

3. To prevent irrational annexations and irregular boundaries, we will ask the Legislature to create a Local Agencies Annexation Commission in each county of the State having two or more cities.

Unlike the existing County Boundary Commission, the new commission would have the power of prior review and final determination over decisions relating to extension of city or district boundaries.

4. To meet the critical need for careful planning and economical land use on a regional basis, we will ask the Legislature to enact a new law making the formation of regional planning districts permissive.

These districts could be activated by a resolution adopted by the legislative bodies of two-thirds of the cities and counties located within their regions. That action would automatically draw the other cities and counties in the region into the district.

A provision of the proposed law protects ABAG's existing regional planning program. And we believe this proposal, if it passes, will strengthen your own efforts to prepare long-range plans for growth on a regional basis.

5. In the field of finance, we are proposing three tax reforms, all of which will lighten the load on the local property taxpayer.

First, we are proposing a sweeping review of our long outmoded tax structure, which too often distributes the tax burden unfairly. We have asked the Legislature to establish a joint Tax Commission to review state, county and city taxes, and to recommend changes which may be put before the voters in the 1964 election.

Second, we are asking for a county-wide equalization formula to equalize the present unfair distribution of taxes for school support. This change, which will produce an additional \$25 million annually, is linked to our request for an additional \$30 million in aid to local school districts.

Third, we propose a reduction of the voter percentage needed to pass bond issues from 66 2/3 percent to 60 percent.

Too often, city governments must pay bonus prices for new schools or parks because a minority of voters can block a bond issue. This proposal will help correct that inequity.

Let me add here, incidentally, that we have asked the Legislature to resubmit the beach and park bond issue which was defeated last June through a quirk of fate and politics.

We appreciate the fact that eight out of the nine Bay Area counties supported the bond issue, and we hope we can count on you the next time around.

6. In transportation, we will continue to press hard for rapid transit, in Los Angeles as well as in San Francisco. We will continue to move ahead with our scenic highway system, and our progressive system of freeways and highways.

When you realize that there will be 11 million automobiles in California by 1966 and 12¾ million by 1970, you can see there is a point of diminishing return in the pouring of more and more cement.

The people of San Francisco, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties should be commended for their wisdom in approving the rapid transit bond issue last November.

The integrity of this system, as approved by the voters, should remain intact. The will of the majority should not be frustrated by taxpayers' suits or legislative proposals exempting portions of the area from the district's tax rolls.

The District has a clear mandate from the people. It should be given the chance to demonstrate the tremendous benefits that will flow from supplementing your excellent network of highways and bridges with modern rapid transit.

We are confident that in time those results will induce the other Bay Area counties to become a part of the system.

The Bay Area has shown the rest of the nation the advantages of the district in meeting urgent transportation needs.

This could not have been accomplished without the leadership of the elected officials of the cities and counties in the district.

We are hopeful that the elected officials in the Los Angeles area will take their cue from what you have done by assuming joint responsibility for the complex problems they share.

7. In housing, we will make a two-pronged attack to revitalize the cities: first, by acting to eliminate the racial ghettos which spawn crime and injustice; and second, by acting to provide decent housing for low-income families.

In my program for Human Rights, now before the Legislature, we have asked that the FEPC be expanded into a Human Rights Commission, with the power to administer a law barring discrimination in housing.

This is a vigorous and controversial effort to strike at the heart of a problem that causes cities to sicken.

My Advisory Commission on Housing Problems has reported that increasing land and building costs are driving low-income families out of the housing market. We will have specific proposals in this field, in a Special Message to the Legislature later this month.

8. In the field of human rights, we have asked the Legislature to eliminate de facto segregation in our schools and to assist students who come from culturally deprived backgrounds.

Through a newly constituted Commission, we intend to assist local school districts in eliminating de facto segregation. But we must do more.

Before the Legislature is Senator McAteer's bill to provide funds for the deprived children who are almost destined to become dropouts and unemployable adults.

This new law would help the schools to furnish special services, including a higher ratio of school personnel, smaller classes, more remedial help in reading and mathematics, more intensive counseling of the child and his parents.

It will help give the child determination to see his schooling through and become an independent, contributing member of society. Please give this bill your support.

9. We will intensify our efforts to preserve irreplaceable scenic assets and natural resources, not only through state and local effort but through working with the Federal government.

Time is too short for me to recount our many cooperative efforts. But it should be clear that no President in history has given more active support to the fight to preserve our streams and forests and coastline than President Kennedy.

You have seen the results in the legislation for Point Reyes National Seashore, and in the recent action of the Federal government in turning over to the state the remaining land on Angel Island.

There must be more Point Reyes Seashores and more Angel Islands.

You and I joined our efforts to bring that about last year in our support for a Federal law to study the shorelines in terms of beauty, history and recreation. That bill has not yet passed—but I am sure the Save the Bay Association will renew the battle. And I will join you in it.

My friends, what we are asking for in these proposals is change and reform. Neither has ever come about easily.

The forces for the status quo are stubborn. There are many who would rather sink in their leaking boat than risk rocking it. And there will be some who will chant that it is subversive to make a regional plan; or that taxes will double overnight if anyone tries to spread any framework on the crazy quilt of local government.

But they will not prevail. There is a strong current of feeling—among you in this room and throughout our state—that runaway growth and ugliness are not inevitable. Urban blight and racial ghettos were not handed to us by destiny. Man put them there and man can remove them.

Let me amend that, my friends. Let us say that man *will* remove them.

In doing so, we will keep our cities pre-eminent in the nation. We will keep our bright land green and golden. And we will preserve the magnificent quality of life in the Bay Area and in California for generations to come.

Thank you.

MARY ELLEN LEARY

Scripps-Howard Correspondent

Summary and Review

One striking element probably apparent to everyone present at this conference concerning the Future of the Bay Area is the sense that this meeting is no isolated effort to focus on this topic. It represents the culmination of many earlier meetings, many preparatory steps. I don't refer just to preparations for today, but to the efforts of many organizations with varying aims who have built towards a sense of reality in the Bay Area drive for unity.

One of the reports from an afternoon panel perceptively noted that the regional concept in the Bay Area is "an iceberg movement." There is much more to it than appears on the surface.

It is clear, from the accord reflected in the various discussion panels at this conference that there is far more interest, support and enthusiasm for the concept of a cohesive Bay Area approach to common problems than either public officials or interested specialists have conceived.

My own view is that this is the singular difference between today's effort to rally a regional point of view in San Francisco Bay Area and that effort in the same direction which proved unsuccessful in the '20s. That was largely the effort of one far-visioned group. Today we have had such multiplicity of effort, such dynamic concern from a host of widely separated sources and for varying reasons—all seeking a regional point of view—that the community's subconscious has become persuaded considerably beyond what conscious expressions would suggest.

Acceptance of the need for an orderly knitting together of the Bay Area, to solve its common problems, runs deep in the general public, I am convinced.

This recognition has been built by the many separate activities in our midst—the development of ABAG, the Army engineers' survey of the Bay, the creation of SPUR with its accompanying renewal of planning awareness in San Francisco, the Market Street study, the frank concern labor organizations have shown in planning for Bay crossings, the League of Women Voters' purposeful examination of metropolitan developments, the interest from Chambers of Commerce and the strong revival of leadership in the business

community through the Bay Area Council. The rapid transit program and proposed broad transportation study have been separate sources for regional awareness. One of the centralizing elements was Mel Scott's splendid study. In addition, both the state and federal governments have worked deliberately to foster a regional approach to our urban problems.

There is a unique quality about the Bay Area which all of this varied effort is concerned with preserving. It is the elusive element of beauty or aesthetic charm or special way of life this area conveys, which underlies many of the arguments raised in today's papers. City Manager Thompson referred to the aesthetic advantages with which the Bay Area is especially blessed and Paul Ylvisaker touched upon it as the special flavor that made this the place in which he would want his children to live.

All of the day's formal papers ranged between enchantment with this element of beauty or the "good life" and a grappling with the reality of our current conflicts and problems.

No real pessimism was expressed; only an insistence on the reality that must be overcome, the lack of planning, the lack of common action, the multiplicity of new communities, the conflicts of interest, the decision-making areas which run contrary to their neighbors—what Roy Sorenson called "haphazard and unguided forces."

If there were omissions in the general discussion of the morning, they fell, I think, into two areas: one is the need for social planning and the other the need for realistic confrontation of the tax problem. To achieve a valid regional approach we need acceptance of some uniform approach to assessments and tax structure, a new approach to the total regional fiscal burden.

* * *

You have just concluded two hours of "work shop" discussions in which several selected leaders from the Bay Area Council, from regional agencies or from government have steered your own discussions.

It is my purpose now to pluck out of reports from these fifteen individual sessions some of the common issues which emerged or seem so strikingly original you would want to share them.

The most common idea—and I believe it to be a critical one—is that there is inadequate public information in regard to regional problems, regional efforts to meet them and the whole regional "movement."

The public does not know what ABAG is, has not been advised why it came into being and is not getting sufficient data on what it is doing.

A consistent point made in various discussion groups was that the people of this region have not begun to think about governmental problems here as inter-related. It was not merely the insufficiency of news about ABAG. The vacuum extends further. The discussion groups raised the issue that our community, our general voting public, has not begun to conceive as regional those problems which spill past local boundaries; the public isn't prepared to look for regional governmental solutions to regional issues.

There were a number of suggestions on how to cope with this.

One was a proposal that study sessions be set up throughout the Bay Region by the Chambers of Commerce. Another was that ABAG itself improve its own publicity and disseminate more news about regional problems. (There weren't any suggestions on how to finance this.) It was also proposed that each city government set up specific studies on home rule and the ramifications of regional government. Bay Area Council sponsorship of study groups was recommended.

A need for specific educational programs to give the public greater awareness of this whole realm came clear in virtually all the sessions.

There was the further suggestion that newspapers of this area be deliberately invited to a greater involvement in the issue, and greater support and enthusiasm for the whole concept. Several panels remarked that newspapers of this area had not displayed concern for the region-wide concept.

One proposal that delighted and surprised me was that the place to begin education in regionalism is in the schools. In fact, your members said elementary schools. Three different sections were specific in urging that the school systems be induced immediately to add, as part of a history or social studies program, a comprehensive study of the Bay Area as a unit, with attention to problems common to the region.

ABAG itself came in for much discussion. I would estimate that about one-third of the afternoon was spent explaining what ABAG is, what are its powers and what ought to be the outside limit of those powers. One striking fact was the absence of dispute over whether there ought to be regional approaches to problems. There were some protests that ABAG isn't adequately understood to permit it to move ahead faster. There was marked awareness that ABAG is a step, or maybe several steps, short of actual metro-

politan government. Many dwelt at length upon the kind of a body which ideally ought to cope with regional problems. One group proposed that ABAG be the vehicle to at least study all regional problems. Another supported open-end districts. It was suggested there may be too much compulsion from federal sources towards a regional concept, as the federal government guides housing, recreation, highway development, etc. Some said this leverage was disproportionate to the initiative from local levels.

In only two sections did there crystallize what you might call a demand for true metropolitan government, another level of government, though the effect of such a new level was discussed by many groups. Only two stressed the need for regional "action" agencies, as opposed to study or fact-gathering ones.

Four, however, did suggest that local officials are going to have to accept some relinquishment of their areas of responsibility. One made the point blunter by saying relinquishment of some of the tax base. This session revolved around the idea that there should be some revenue, now available to local governments, which ought to be directed to meeting regional problems. But there seems to be no demand from this conference for a Dade County or a Toronto "Metro." Most of you indicated the Bay Area may be ahead of such areas, anyway. But it was generally agreed we cannot move towards sound regional activity without lively participation by local government officials.

There was discussion of the McAteer Bill, setting up study of the Bay Area's transportation. Focus here was on the need for this to evolve as a policy-making body, not just a data-collecting body.

Several groups spent time talking about the transportation problem. There was concern lest monorail proposals be distracting elements rather than cohesive ones. There was genuine interest in two different groups in whether Santa Clara ought to be in the rapid transit district or whether it is growing to be such a large population and economic center distinct from the rest of the Bay Area that it would be harmful to it and to the San Francisco-Oakland area to involve it in the rapid transit system. This discussion did not reach any conclusion. But the problem of the relationship of this northern Bay sector with the Santa Clara area was primarily related to transportation.

There was discussion about how costly rapid transit is and what it represents in tax burdens on property. No group, however, reported any dissent from the approval of rapid transit.

One group, particularly concerned with transportation, raised the issue of airports and came to the conclusion that a joint use by

the region of the San Francisco and Oakland airports should be recognized as desirable and worked for.

One point I feel particularly worth quoting: "We must never forget that the people came here to live. They didn't come here because they can get a job for more money. That wasn't the main motivating force. We must be concerned about the preservation of an area where people want to live."

Another panel said that physical planning for the Bay Area must be predicated squarely, and in the first instance, upon human and social needs.

This was the same group that said, "All feasible steps must be taken to insure maximum sustained involvement and responsibility in the regional planning process by local government."

The question was raised: Can local governmental bodies be induced to take an active interest in planning on problems that do not immediately concern them? This, in general, was earnestly debated in several panels, worried less self-interest preclude an involvement by those not immediately affected.

A number of panels made the point forcefully that if regional decisions are to be made through regional bodies, there must be offered the public first some evidence that a tax-saving or other real and valid benefits would result.

Two groups urged application of modern technology towards assembling regional data and a third specifically recommended a Bay Area "data bank." There was marked awareness that to perceive the Bay Area as a region, a different set of figures, and consequently a different perspective is required than merely the sum of all local figures. "Piecing together" it was clear, is not the same as a new view of the whole.

A number of isolated comments were interesting.

One was concern about unified stimulus for international trade here and for integration of port facilities. Another considered chances of creating a better climate for industrial encouragement, particularly in areas keyed to the space age. Another advocated tax abatement to encourage businesses needed here for economic balance.

This has been a remarkable conference. It represents a hill-top in the drive for a better way of life in this region. The panels proved that regional discussion is no longer just fine theory; it now is focused upon action.



SPONSORS

Bay Area Council
San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association
Association of Bay Area Governments

COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS

American Institute of Planners, Northern California Chapter
Bay Area Aviation Committee
Bay Area Real Estate Research Committee
Bay Area Planning Directors Committee
Bay Area Welfare Planning Federation
Berkeley Chamber of Commerce
Citizens for Regional Recreation and Parks
Contra Costa County Development Association
Junior Chamber Bay Region Council
Leagues of Women Voters of the Bay Area
Marin Council for Civic Affairs
Marin County Development Association
Napa Chamber of Commerce
Oakland Chamber of Commerce
Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce
Richmond Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
San Jose Chamber of Commerce
San Mateo County Development Association
San Rafael Chamber of Commerce
Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce
Save San Francisco Bay Association
Sonoma County Industrial Development Board
Vallejo Chamber of Commerce

